

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion to Assess and Revise the New Regulatory Framework for Pacific Bell and Verizon California Incorporated.

Rulemaking 01-09-001
(Filed September 6, 2001)

Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion to Assess and Revise the New Regulatory Framework for Pacific Bell and Verizon California Incorporated.

Investigation 01-09-002
(Filed September 6, 2001)

RULING EXTENDING TIME TO FILE REPLY COMMENTS IN PHASE 3A

TURN has requested an extension of time to file reply comments in Phase 3A of this proceeding. Phase 3A involves the following issues:

Phase 3A Issues		
	Issue	Reference
1.	Timing of Price Cap Advice Letter: Phase 3A will address whether Pacific and Verizon should file their annual price cap advice letters on September 1 st instead of October 1 st as is currently the case. The purpose of requiring the advice letters to be filed one month earlier would be to provide Commission staff with adequate time to process the advice letters prior to the implementation of new rates on January 1 st of the following year.	OIR 01-09-001 & OII 01-09-002, Appendix A, p. A-8.

<p>2.</p>	<p>Criteria and Procedures for Revising Prices: Phase 3A will address what criteria and procedures (other than those resolved in R.98-07-038) should be used to revise (1) prices for services in Categories 1, 2 and 3; and (2) price floors and ceilings for Category 2 services. Topics that are within the scope of this proceeding include the criteria and procedures (other than those resolved in R.98-07-038) that should be used to set and revise prices for (1) promotional offerings, (2) bundled offerings, and (3) customer-specific contracts. Parties should address whether the current criteria and procedures are adequate, or if the criteria and procedures need to be refined or replaced. Parties are encouraged to address whether and how parties besides Pacific and Verizon may propose price changes. Issues that are beyond the scope of this proceeding include the following: (1) changes to the existing definitions of Category 1, 2, and 3; (2) changes to the existing categorization of services; (3) changes to existing prices, price caps, and price floors; and (4) changes to Commission review procedures resolved in R.98-07-038.</p> <p>In connection with the foregoing issues, parties are invited to address the following questions:</p> <p>(a) What criteria, procedures and rules should apply to requests for changes to ceiling prices and actual prices for Category 2 services? Who should be permitted to make such requests? Should service-specific price changes be made revenue neutral? If so, how should this be accomplished? If there are instances in which revenue neutrality should be required, are there instances in which revenue neutrality should not be required?</p> <p>(b) Should the current rules and procedures for adjusting price floors be changed? If so, how?</p> <p>(c) What criteria, procedures, and rules should apply to requests to change Category 3 ceiling and actual prices?</p>	<p>OIR 01-09-001 & OII 01-09-002, Appendix A, pp. A-8 and A-9, as further explained in the 12/27/01 ACR.</p>
-----------	---	--

	<p>(d) What criteria should apply to deciding whether Category 3 services are accounted for above- or below-the-line?</p> <p>(e) What criteria, rules, and procedures should apply to requests for approval of bundled offerings? Should any special rules apply when the bundle includes services that are not rate-regulated by the CPUC, such as wireless services? What terms and conditions should apply when the bundle includes services that, when sold separately, have different applicable terms and conditions (e.g., regarding early termination charges).</p> <p>(f) What criteria, rules and procedures should apply to requests for promotional offerings?</p> <p>(g) What criteria, rules and procedures should apply to requests for customer-specific contracts? For which types of customers should such contracts be allowed?</p> <p>The above questions are provided to clarify and highlight certain issues to be addressed in Phase 3A. They are not meant to subtract any issues from those identified in the Order instituting this proceeding or the 12/27/01 ACR. To the extent the above questions add issues that are not clearly delineated in the Order or 12/27/01 ACR, then these questions will be interpreted as supplementing, i.e., broadening, the scope of the proceeding.</p>	
--	--	--

No party opposed the request. In view of the many tasks facing the parties in this proceeding at once and the intervening Thanksgiving holiday, TURN's request is reasonable. Therefore, I extend the schedule for reply comments to December 13, 2002. All other dates remain unchanged. The revised schedule is as follows:

Phase 3A Schedule	
Event	Date
Written Comments re: Phase 3A Issues	Opening Comments: October 31, 2002 Reply Comments: December 13, 2002 (changed from Nov. 26, 2002)
Draft Decision re: Phase 3A	February 2003
Final Decision re: Phase 3A	March 2003

Dated December 3, 2002, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ SARAH THOMAS

Sarah Thomas
Administrative Law Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have by mail this day served a true copy of the original attached Ruling Extending Time to File Reply Comments in Phase 3A on all parties of record in this proceeding or their attorneys of record.

Dated December 3, 2002, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ FANNIE SID

Fannie Sid

N O T I C E

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to insure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.